

English Reformation ; the Nag's-head Story.

1.—*P. F. Courayer's Defence of the Validity of the English Ordinations, &c.* 2 Vols. London, 1728.

2.—*The Validity of Anglican Ordinations, Examined &c.* By the Very Rev. P. R. KENRICK. Philadelphia, 1841.

It is generally admitted that the Church of Rome has preserved an unbroken succession of Bishops, from the times of the blessed Apostles. Among all the charges which have been so justly urged against that corrupt branch of the Christian Church, no one has seriously raised a question as to the genuineness of her Episcopacy, or of her Ministry having descended through an unbroken succession of Episcopal Consecrators, from the very earliest times. The very tenacity with which the Primitive Church adhered to the maxim, "None but Bishops can ordain," as clearly appears in history, forbids the supposition of any Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, having been created in any other way than by the laying on of hands, and prayer, of a Bishop, or Bishops. During the ages of mediæval darkness, this maxim was certainly not less regarded ; and while morals and manners were sadly corrupted, and even the Faith endangered, to human appearances, on this,—the exclusive right of Bishops to perpetuate, at least their own Office,—there was never but one opinion, in either the Eastern or Western Churches. Hence, any attempt to prove the Succession previous to the English Reformation, would be gratuitous and uncalled for.

In the mighty movement of the sixteenth century, however, by which many great changes were wrought, and in the course of which the Continental Reformers seceded from the Church of Rome, and formally ignored the Episcopal Office, (in consequence of there being no Bishops concerned in the movement,) it is readily granted that there was, humanly speaking, a possibility of some mis-step, by which the Succession might

be broken in England. True, the movement in England was unlike that of the Continent, as it was a *Reformation*, and not a secession. A large proportion of the English Bishops entered cheerfully into it, and freely put forth all their energies for its consummation; so that there was manifestly no *necessity* for any breach in the Succession. Nevertheless, in the confusion and turmoil of the times, there was certainly a liability to fall into irregularities; and but for the unflinching integrity of the great conservative minds of the age, which the providence of God had raised up for that peculiar work, there would have been a strong probability of fearful innovations. Happily for us, however, we are not called on to contemplate it in its incipency, and to calculate probabilities. To us it is matter of *history*; and in the clear light of historic truth we are to examine it.

First of all, we must give a rapid sketch of the Reformation itself, from the commencement of the movement to the times when it was brought to so happy a consummation in the reign of Elizabeth.

Among the popular errors which have long passed without correction, and which the papists cunningly strive to perpetuate, is that which refers the whole movement of the Reformation to the private quarrel of Henry VIII. with the Pope, on the subject of his divorce from his first wife, Catharine, of Arragon. That this hastened the movement there can be no question; and that it was, under God, the proximate cause of the first open rupture between England and the Papal Court, is certain. But the spirit of the Reformation had long been slowly kindling in the heart of the English people;—even before its appearance in Germany or Switzerland. The popular sympathy evinced, both at home and abroad, in the labor and suffering of John Wickliff, who first translated the Scriptures into the English language, told with unerring certainty that the elements of a fearful commotion were even then working. The inner life of the Church, and the very humanity of an outraged Christendom, were rising in their might to throw off the incubus of superstition and corruption, which, for ages, had borne them down. In this state of things, the heroic and daring King Henry became but the spokesman of the general

mind of his times, when he boldly hurled defiance at the Papal Court, and refused longer to recognize its jurisdiction in England. In confirmation of what is here asserted, we quote from England's great historian, Hume. Speaking of the state of things in 1529, he says ;

“ The complaints against the usurpations of the ecclesiastics had been very ancient in England, as well as in most other European kingdoms ; and as this topic had now become popular, everywhere, it had paved the way for the Lutheran tenets, and reconciled the people, in some measure, to the frightful idea of heresy and innovation. The commons, finding the occasion favorable, passed several bills restraining the impositions of the clergy ; one for the regulating of monasteries ; another against the exactions for the probates of wills ; a third against non-residence and pluralities, and against churchmen being farmers of land. But what appeared chiefly dangerous to the ecclesiastical order, were the severe invectives thrown out, almost without opposition, in the house, against the dissolute lives of the priests ; their ambition, their avarice, and their endless encroachments on the laity.”

In short, the philosopher can hardly fail to read, in the Reformation, a natural out-cropping of the spirit of the times ;—the breaking forth of a popular indignation, which had long been suppressed, but which had now acquired a degree of power that bade defiance to all restraints ; and although the *Christian* may take yet higher grounds, and look on it as the unfolding of the deep designs of Providence, he cannot fail to embrace, in his view, the same working of proximate causes.

We have indulged in this digression for the purpose of showing that the Reformation resulted, not, as has been commonly asserted, from the private quarrel of King Henry, but from the operation of deep-seated causes which had been slowly, but certainly, tending to this result, for centuries.

In 1533, the decisive step was taken, which ultimately released the English Church from papal rule ; and this was confessedly an act of Parliament, and of the Crown, rather than an ecclesiastical movement ; though the evidence is conclusive that the movement met with a hearty response in the great mind of the English Church. Nay, the general regret was, that the movement had not proceeded farther. For it does not appear that Henry had, at that time, nor in fact at any time, any serious objections to the teachings of the Romish

Church, so far as *doctrine* was concerned. *His* sole object seems to have been to throw off the papal *rule*. Hence, he contented himself with simply striking out of the Ordinal the Oath of obedience to the Pope, which all Bishops had been required to take, at the time of their Consecration. With this exception, all the rites and ceremonies prescribed by the Romish Ritual were preserved. For the purpose of enforcing this change, a statute was enacted, that "No Bishop elect shall hunt after Bulls, or apostolical mandates from the Pope, concerning consecration; but only exhibit the royal mandate, by authority whereof, being ordained, (consecrated,) by three Bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitan, according to act of parliament, and in imitation of the ancient canons, he shall be accepted as a true Bishop; nor shall any body otherwise ordained, (consecrated,) be acknowledged as such." By an additional statute, it was made imperative on the Archbishops and Bishops, whensoever the King's Patent should be addressed to them for the consecration of a Bishop, to proceed at once with the Office of consecration. Thus things remained until after the death of Henry VIII.

But after the accession of Edward VI. other and more important changes were introduced. In 1549, the Romish Ordinal was wholly abolished, and another form of Consecration set forth by Parliament, which was soon after embodied in the Book of Common Prayer. This has been censured by Romanists as an assumption of spiritual prerogatives by a secular body, which had no right to interfere in the affairs of the Church. The Ordinal, however, was not prepared by Parliament, but only ordered and set forth. The names of the men who drew up that instrument are preserved. Besides Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, there were six other Bishops, and six Doctors, (Presbyters.) The Bishops were Goodrich, Bishop of Ely, Holbech, of Lincoln, Day, of Chichester, Skip, of Hereford, Thirlby, of Westminster, and Ridley, of Rochester. The Doctors were Cox, May, Taylor, Heynes, Robertson, and Redmayne. No laymen were engaged in it. Neither the King nor Parliament attempted to specify the changes that should be made, but left it entirely to the piety and

goodly learning of these ecclesiastics, to make such changes as they thought requisite, and justified by the Ancient Canons. The new form was not even required to be submitted to the King, or Parliament, after it was arranged; but according to the act of Parliament, went into operation as soon as it was completed. These same men, also, drew up the reformed Liturgy entire. In 1552, when it had been used three years, Parliament directed this Ordinal to be annexed to the Book of Common Prayer, and set forth under its special endorsement.

On the death of Edward VI. and the accession of Queen Mary, of course all the changes under Henry and Edward were rescinded, and the Romish Ritual restored entire. Then, on the death of Mary, and the accession of Elizabeth, every thing was restored to the condition in which it had been left at the death of Edward. Her first Parliament, held in 1559, restored the Book of Common Prayer, entire, with the new Ordinal; and the Parliament of 1566 confirmed this act, and declared all Consecrations which had been performed within the past seven years, under the Ordinal, to be entirely legal. Thus, we have the highest possible testimony to their *legality*, according to the laws of the realm. Of course, their *validity* remains to be argued. With very slight alteration, this form of Consecration is still retained in the Church of England, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, as well as of Scotland.

We come now to an important question: *Are the Consecrations of Archbishop Parker, and other Bishops consecrated under Elizabeth, to be regarded as valid?*

No calamity which has ever befallen the Church of Rome has caused her such intense mortification and chagrin, as did the English Reformation, by which her jurisdiction was formally disowned, and her many abuses exposed, and forever abandoned. Even then, England had shown unmistakable signs of her latent power, and given more than promise of the importance which she has since assumed among the nations of the earth. But England, the brightest jewel in the Papal crown, was now lost. The movement had not been of a violent or revolutionary character; it had been proceeding with slow and

steady pace through nearly five successive reigns, and had now culminated in so complete and orderly an establishment that there could be no reasonable hope of England ever soliciting a reconciliation to the bosom of the Papal Church. It was the more humiliating, from the fact that it had accomplished that for which it had set out;—a *Reformation*, and not a *revolution*, nor a secession. At the Continental Protestants, who had *seceded*, and of necessity abandoned Episcopacy, Rome could affect a sneer, and remind them that according to the Ancient Canons, and the universal customs of the Church of all ages, there could be no Church without Bishops, Priests and Deacons. But in England it was different. The same Church remained which had been there from A. D. 35, and the Romanists of England were the only seceders. Still, it was necessary to cover the disgrace by casting some reproach on the Reformed Church. For many years, no allegation was made, save that she was heretical, and in schism, not being in the embrace of the papacy. At length, when some years had elapsed since the consecration of Archbishop Parker, and when it was thought safe to raise questions of fact, Romish stories began to be set on foot concerning the consecration of the Elizabethan Bishops. Of course, it was readily granted, that unless Matthew Parker had been truly consecrated to the Office of Bishop, there must be a breach in the English succession, and hence, the English Church had lapsed into mere Presbyterianism.

The first objection urged was, that although Parker, and the other Bishops consecrated about the same time, had gone through the ceremony of Consecration, their Consecration was invalid, in consequence of William Barlow, one of the consecrating Bishops, having never, himself, been consecrated. This story was circulated by Romanists, soon after Parker's consecration. This, however, not being deemed very reliable, or sufficient for the purpose for which it was intended, after the lapse of about fifty years, another story was set in circulation, since known as the "Nag's-head Story;" and this, although it has been refuted by the documents, and other most reliable testimony, has been, at times, ever since, harped on by Romanists;—nor only by Romanists, but by some non-Episco-

pal Protestants, who have eagerly laid hold on any thing calculated to throw discredit on the pretensions of the English Church.

The "Nag's-head Story," already alluded to, is thus given by Dr. Champney, (a Romish priest,) in a book "On the Vocation of Bishops." It was published in English in 1616, and in Latin, two years later :

"In the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, the Catholic Bishops being deposed and imprisoned, as shall be seen hereafter, others were to be ordained, and substituted in their places. They who were nominated and elected to this dignity met at London by appointment, at the sign of the Nag's head in Cheap-side; thither likewise, upon invitation, came the Bishop of Landaff, grown decrepid by reason of his age, and a simple timorous man, from whom the new candidates expected consecration. But Bonner, Bishop of London, then in prison upon the account of religion, hearing of it, threatened Landaff with excommunication if he ordained them; who, being terrified by this message, and perhaps, being inwardly touched with the stings of conscience, drew back, and refused to lay his hands on them, alleging the weakness of his eyes as the cause. The new candidates being thus deceived in their expectations, and thinking themselves imposed upon, began to revile the old man, whom they had before treated with a great deal of reverence and respect; some of them saying, 'This fool believes we cannot be made Bishops unless we are greased with oyl,' ridiculing as well the old Bishop, as this Catholic custom of consecration. But being thus deprived of a consecrator, they were forced to seek for a new expedient; and they had recourse to Scory, an apostate monk, for their ordination, who, under Edward VI. had usurped a Bishoprick without any consecration, as shall be made to appear hereafter. This man, who had, together with his religious habit, put off all conscience, soon performed what they desired, using this ceremony:—They kneeling before him, and he laying the Bible upon the head of each of them, said 'Receive power to preach the Word of God sincerely,' and thus they all rose up Bishops."

After thus gravely setting forth this ridiculous story, Champney adds that he had the account orally from "*one named Thomas Bluet*," who received it orally from *one Thomas Neal*, an officer of Bishop Bonner's, who was sent by Bonner to the Bishop of Landaff, to forbid him to act in the consecration, and to be a witness of whatever might transpire. This seems to have been the first *written* account of the mysterious Nags-head Consecration; seeing that Champney obtained it orally from "*one named Thomas Bluet*," who received it from a *certain Thomas Neal*. Mark; it is now fifty-seven years since its occurrence; and now, for the first time, it is written. After fifty-seven years it had amounted to nothing more than hearsay.

The third and last allegation against the English consecrations, is based on the assumed insufficiency of the form of Consecration used ; the records showing that the Ordinal of Edward VI. was the one used on that occasion.

These three allegations we propose to treat separately, and in the following order. 1st. The Nag's-head Story; 2nd. Barlow's want of Consecration ; and 3rd. The insufficiency of the form used by Barlow, at Parker's Consecration. These three are the principal allegations of Romanists against the English Succession. Some minor points have been raised, but these are believed to be the only ones to which Romanists have ever attached much importance.

And first, the Nags-head Story. This remarkable story, were we entirely without positive testimony to the fact of Parker's Consecration, would justly take rank with the story of "Pope Joan," if not with the Arabian Nights Entertainments. Even in modern times, when far less importance is attached to consecrated *places* than formerly, the idea of anything so important as the Consecration of a Bishop taking place in a *tavern*, could hardly escape public ridicule ; and we venture to assert that such a Consecration would command little more respect than did the modern story of Wesley having made Cooke Bishop, "up stairs in Bristol ;" though all will admit that a Consecration thus private *might* have all the circumstances necessary to validity.

But the question most naturally arises, what could have been the object of conducting a ceremony of so much importance in the estimation of the English people, and of all Christendom, in secret ? Surely, it was contrary to all custom, either ancient or modern. Moreover, there was no necessity for it. The Protestants were, at that time, in no danger of persecution from Romanists, seeing that the Crown, the Parliament, and the minds of the whole nation were on their side ; and no public act, after the coronation of their Queen, could have awakened a more lively interest among the English people, than the consecration of their Metropolitan. We know it is said by Romanists, that they sought privacy from the fact that they knew the whole performance would appear ridiculous to

the public, inasmuch as the Consecrator was known not to be a Bishop. But it should be observed that, according to the Nag's-head Story, the Bishops elect went to the tavern with the confident expectation of being consecrated by the "old Bishop of Landaff," whom Romanists, all, admitted to be a genuine Bishop, of their own consecrating; that he came for the purpose of consecrating them, but on his arrival, met Thomas Neal, who bore a message to him from Bonner, charging him, on pain of excommunication, to take no part in the Consecration; that he affected weakness of vision, and declined to act; whereupon they had recourse to Scory, who, at the same time and place, proceeded to make them Bishops! If this part of the story be true, there was then no need for secrecy, on the ground of the intended consecrator being known not to be a Bishop, seeing that Landaff was known and approved of all, as such. Had the time and place been appointed with the expectation that Scory, or some one known not to be a Bishop, was to be the consecrator, there might have been some reason for having it "done in a corner;" but seeing that Landaff was expected to officiate, there could have been no such reason.

But granting that they thus met at the tavern for the purpose of avoiding public notice and remark, the question arises, why did they not choose a place *still more* private than the Nag's-head Tavern in Cheapside? If secrecy had been the object, doubtless private parlors, or upper rooms, might have been commanded, as well as the Nag's-head Tavern, which would certainly have secured the object much better. Or, suppose they had a private apartment in the tavern; then a question arises, how came "*Thomas Neal, an officer of Bonner's,*" to be present, and able to testify to the farcical consecration by Scory? Let it be observed that the whole story rests on the testimony of this *Thomas Neal*. He had come with a letter, or message, from Bonner, to forbid the old Bishop of Landaff acting, and accomplished this object; but most strangely, is at once admitted into the private chamber, and becomes a witness of what transpired. Had he gone out at once, and published the story, it might have appeared as respectable as some of the

disclosures of Titus Bates, of later times ; but seeing that Champney, after fifty-seven years, had only seen "one named Thomas Bluet, who had received it of Thomas Neal," in all probability long since in his grave, the story becomes wholly unworthy of credit. Indeed, it is gratifying to observe that even Archbishop Kenrick, in his desperate effort to palm off the Nag's-head Story on the American people, was too careful of his reputation to say that *he* believed it, or that *he* thought it credible.

Another view of the matter has struck us with much force. The impression intended to be made is, that they had resolved to have Consecration private, for purpose of preventing remark on its irregularity. But what course could possibly have done so much to awaken suspicion, as this strange and unheard of procedure ? If the object had been to avoid suspicion, and to pass off a sham Consecration for a real one, is it not supposable that ordinary sagacity would have suggested the importance of throwing around it every possible circumstance of regularity ? A departure from all usage would naturally cause remark, and lead to the inquiry, why was it thus ? Moreover, of all the monarchs of England, no one was ever more remarkable for love of state, or pageant, than was Elizabeth. All writers agree that her tastes, in this respect, would have led her greatly to prefer the Church of Rome. No one who studies her character can believe, for a moment, that she would ever have allowed the Consecration of her primate to take place in a tavern ; nor in any private house. In regard to her general conduct in this respect, we are assured by Sanders, (a Romanist,) that notwithstanding the repeal of the old laws, Queen Elizabeth always took care that those whom she nominated for Bishops were Ordained, (Consecrated,) with the ceremonies prescribed by the laws of the realm.

Besides all this, it is not very probable that the "old Bishop of Landaff" would have been very much terrified by the threatening message which he is said to have received from Bonner ; seeing that he had already taken the Oath of Allegiance to the new Queen, (Elizabeth,) by which he was as badly embarrassed with the papal authority as he could possibly be by any additional act of disobedience to the papacy.

It may not be out of place here to remark, that even if it were proved that Parker had no other Consecration than the one alleged at Nag's-head, he might, even then, have been a true Bishop, according to ancient usage, and general consent. For the assertion that Scory had never been consecrated a Bishop, but had, "under Edward VI. usurped a bishoprick, without consecration," is utterly false, if records are to be believed. His Consecration is distinctly recorded in Cranmer's Archi-Episcopal register; he is spoken of by numerous writers as a Bishop, first, of Chichester, and afterwards of Hereford; and but for the Nag's-head Story, no one would ever have doubted that he was such. There can be no reasonable doubt that he was a Bishop, and as such had the right to consecrate other Bishops; for it is a well recognized principle of Ancient Canons, and has been frequently acted on, that even one Bishop may consecrate Bishops; and that their Consecration is to be held *valid*;—though not *canonized*. Hence, if we were to admit the truth of the Nag's-head Story, and yet could prove the fact of Scory's being a Bishop, we could not fail to establish the validity of Parker's Consecration;—provided the form used contained the essence of Consecration. To this, however, we attach no importance, farther than it serves to show the falsehood contained in the statement, that Scory "had intruded himself into the episcopal function without consecration." The more falsehoods can be proved to enter into the story, the more we shall be able to show why it should all be discredited.

One more argument against the credibility of this story is drawn from the fact that it declares *all* the new Bishops to have been consecrated by Scory at the same time. (Strangely enough, it has never had any date!) But according to Rymer's Records, as well as Parker's official register, they were consecrated at different times. Thus, Parker was consecrated alone, on the seventeenth of December, 1559. On the twenty-first of the same month, Parker consecrated four others, two more on the second of March, 1560, and still two others on the twenty-fourth of March. So it is stated in the register kept by Parker, and which was found among his papers after

his death. In accordance with this, the State Records of Elizabeth, still accessible in the royal archives, show that her commissions for the Consecrations of the new Bishops were issued at different times, and at times corresponding with the registered dates of the Consecration. If, then, the Nag's-head Story be true, not only must Parker's register be false, but the authentic, civil records of the nation be rejected.

We are aware that the question may be raised, with some show of plausibility, How are we to account for the existence and currency of such a story, if there were no foundation for it? To this, we might, without any violation of logic, reply that it is not our work to account for it. If the truthful man were bound to account for every falsehood which might be set in circulation, and show how it came to be, his labors, we apprehend, would be greater than many would be willing to undertake.

We may here remark, however, that Parker's *Confirmation* did take place eight days before his Consecration; and judging from certain incidental points in history, we conclude that it may have been no uncommon thing for the Bishops about those times, to meet at a private house or tavern, for this purpose, (there being no public service connected with it,) and for the Bishop elect to furnish a dinner to the Bishops and others, at his own expense. It is by no means improbable that something of this kind may have occurred at the time of Parker's confirmation, (ratification,) and that it may have been at the Nag's-head Tavern; and *Thomas Neal*, or some other person, either from ignorance or wickedness, may have made the Nag's-head Story out of this. This is plausible; and the more so, from the fact that the story, as generally held by Romanists, goes on to say that, after the Consecration, a dinner was served up at Parker's expense. In support of this, we will quote a few sentences from Heylin, which we have just now observed:

"But to proceed unto the consecration of the new archbishop, the first thing to be done, after the passing the royal assent for ratifying of the election of the dean and chapter, was the confirming it in the Court of Arches, according to the usual form in that behalf; which being accordingly performed, the Vicar Gen-

eral, the Dean of the Arches, the proctors and officers of the court, whose presence was required at this solemnity, were entertained at a dinner provided for them, at the Nag's Head tavern, in Cheapside ; for which, although Parker paid the shot, yet shall the Church be called to an after-reckoning."

We now come to speak of *Authentic Records concerning the Consecration of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury.*

Having already pointed out some of the features in the Nag's-head Story, which make it altogether incredible, we now proceed to present positive testimony, showing that Parker was regularly consecrated, in accordance with the Ordinal of the Church, established by Edward VI., repealed by Queen Mary, and restored on the accession of Elizabeth. And, proceeding on the maxim that "the better way of refuting a falsehood is to demonstrate its opposite," we hope to satisfy our readers of the absurdity of the entire Nag's-head Story.

Cardinal Pole, the Archbishop of Canterbury, under Queen Mary, survived the Queen but a few hours. Hence, on the accession of Elizabeth, she found the See of Canterbury vacant.

The importance of the post required that it should be filled with the least possible delay. Parker had filled several important posts, in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. ; but during the reign of Mary, had shut himself up in "lettered seclusion." Now, he was recalled to court, to assist in the work of restoring the Reformation. His entire devotion to this work, together with his eminent learning, soon signalized him to the Queen as a fit person to fill the vacant See of Canterbury. Accordingly, on the 18th of July, 1559, the Queen issued her *Conge d'elire* to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury for an election ; and on the first day of August following, Matthew Parker was duly elected. On the ninth of September following, she issued her royal commission to six Bishops, ordering them to proceed to the confirmation and Consecration of the Bishop elect. These Bishops were Cuthbert, Bishop of Durham, Gilbert, Bishop of Bath, David, Bishop of Peterborough, Anthony, Bishop of Landaff, William Barlow, and John Scory, Bishops, at that time, without Sees. From some cause, this commission was never executed. Most probably, some of the Bishops therein named remained Romanists, and

so refused to act in the Consecration. In fact, it is well-known that many of the Bishops of Mary opposed the Reformation under Elizabeth. On the sixth of December, another commission was issued to the same effect; but directed to Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Llandaff, William Barlow, John Scory, Miles Coverdale, Richard (John) de Bedford, John de Thetford, and John Bale, Bishop of Osory, calling on them, *or any four of them*, to proceed to the confirmation and Consecration. Anthony Kitchin, "the old Bishop of Llandaff," it is true, refused, or failed, to act, either from infirmity, or from a timidity in presiding at the first Consecration under the new law; and William Barlow became the presiding Bishop, assisted by Scory, Coverdale, and John Hodgkin, of Bedford. These four proceeded to the confirmation and Consecration of Parker. The confirmation took place on the ninth of December, 1559, and the Consecration on Sunday, the seventeenth of the same month, (1559,) by the same Bishops who had confirmed the election eight days previous. The Consecration was performed in the Archi-Episcopal Chapel at Lambeth, and was duly recorded in the Registers of Canterbury, and also in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. It was also found in Parker's register, after his death. We shall copy the one found in Cambridge, that being the one printed in the Works of Archbishop Bramhall, and differing very little, as we shall hereafter see, from the Canterbury Record, kept in Lambeth Palace. Believing that it may be agreeable to many of our readers, we here present a translation of it.

"The order of the consecration of the Rt. Rev. Father in Christ, Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, held in his Chapel at Lambeth, at his manor, on Sunday, the 17th day of the month of DECEMBER, ANNO DOMINI, 1559.

In the first place, the chapel was adorned with hangings in the eastern part; moreover, the floor was covered with red cloth; the table, placed in the east necessary for performing the sacred rites, was covered with a cloth and cushion. Besides, four chairs for the four Bishops, to whom had been committed the duty of consecrating the Archbishop, had been placed in the southeast. Moreover, a kneeling stool, covered with cloth and cushions, on which the Bishops kneeled on bended knees, was placed before the chairs. In like manner, a chair and kneeling stool, covered with cloth and cushion, had been placed in the northern quarter of the eastern part of the same chapel.

These things being thus arranged in their order, (due form,) about five or six o'clock in the morning, the Archbishop approached the chapel through the western gate, clothed in a toga and scarlet cap, four torches preceding, and accompanied by the four Bishops who were to officiate at his consecration; viz. by name, William Barlow, formerly Bishop of Bath and Wells, but now elected to the bishoprick of Chichester; John Scory, formerly Bishop of Chichester, but now called to Hereford; Miles Coverdale, formerly Bishop of Exeter, and John Hodgkins, Suffragan Bishop of Bedford. After that all these had occupied the seats prepared for them, each in his rank, morning prayers were read by the Chaplain, Andrew Pearson, in a clear voice; which finished, John Scory, of whom we have before made mention, ascended the desk, and having taken for himself, as a text, "The elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also an elder," &c., (or from the Vulgate, "*Seniores ergo qui in nobis sunt obsecro consenior*," &c. proceeded to discourse, not inelegantly. The discourse finished, the Archbishop and the other four Bishops went out of the chapel to prepare themselves for the Holy Communion; and, having gone into the vestry through the northern door, they returned without delay, dressed in this manner:—The Archbishop was clothed in a surplice, as they call it. The Bishop elect of Chichester, prepared for performing the sacred rites, wore a silk cap, to whom ministered and lent them aid, the two archi-episcopal Chaplains, Nicholas Bullingham, archdeacon of Lincoln, and Edward Gest, also archdeacon of Canterbury, in like manner clothed with silk caps. Hereford elect, and the suffragan of Bedford, were clothed in linen surplices. Miles Coverdale used a long woolen gown.

In this manner clothed, they proceeded to celebrate the communion, the Archbishop resting on bended knees on the lowest step of the chancel. The Gospel being finished, Hereford elect, Suffragan of Bedford, and Miles Coverdale, concerning whom before, the Bishop elect of Chichester, sitting before the Archbishop in a chair by the table, addressed him in these words: "Rev. Father in God; This man, of equal learning and piety, we offer and present to you to be consecrated Archbishop." Immediately after they had said these things, the commission of the Queen for the consecration of the Archbishop was presented, which being read by the Rev. Thomas Yale, LL.D., the oath of royal supremacy, or of preserving its supreme authority, decreed and promulged the first year of the reign of our illustrious Queen Elizabeth, was required of the same Archbishop, which, when he had solemnly laid his hands on the Holy Gospel, he took upon himself in a set form of words, the Bishop elect of Chichester having prefaced a few things; and having exhorted the people to devotion, he prepared himself for repeating the Liturgies; the choir responding. This having been performed, after some questions proposed by the elect Chichester, and after the devotions and certain suffrages, performed in the presence of God, according to the formula in the book published by act of parliament, the Bishops of Chichester and Hereford, the suffragan of Bedford, and Miles Coverdale, having placed their hands on the Archbishop's head, said, in English: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee, by the imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness."

These words having been thus spoken, they delivered into his hands the Holy Bible, after this manner saying to him:—"See that thou be diligent in reading;

and continually meditate on those things which are written in these Books. Be unwilling to lack diligence in these books, in order that the advancement coming thence may be known to all, and may be remarkable. Have diligent care of those things which pertain to you, and to your office of teaching; for in this way shalt thou save, not only thyself, but thy hearers; through Jesus Christ our Lord.”*

After they had said these things, the Bishop elect of Chichester proceeded to the remaining ceremonies of the communion, delivering to the Archbishop no pastoral staff, with which the Archbishop, together with the other Bishops, communicated, with some others also.

The ceremonies having been, at length, ended, the Archbishop departed through the northern door of the eastern part of the Chapel, accompanied by those four Bishops who had consecrated him; and, attended by those same Bishops, he returned through the same door, clothed in a white episcopal surplice, and with a *crimera*, (as they call it,) of black silk. Moreover, he wore, fastened around his neck, a collar of precious sable skins, in common language called sables. And in like manner, Chichester and Hereford were each clothed in their episcopal vestments; in the surplice and *crimera*, also. Dr. Coverdale and the Suffragan of Bedford, wore only long gowns.

The Archbishop, then proceeding toward the west door, gave to Thomas Doyle, the steward, John Baker, the treasurer, and John Marsh, keeper of the rolls, each, a white staff; in this manner signifying to them their duties and offices. These things having been performed in their own fashion, as aforesaid, the Archbishop left the chapel through the western door, those of nobler blood, in his own family, preceding him; the rest following behind.

All these things were performed in the presence of the Rev. Bishops, Edmand Gryndall, Bishop elect of London, Richard Cokes, Bishop elect of Ely, Edwin Sandes, Bishop elect of Worcester, Anthony Huse, principal Knight and chief secretary of the Archbishop, and Thomas Argall, Knight and register at Chichester,—the first officer of Canterbury,—Thomas Willet and John Jacent, notaries public; and some others.”

“Agrees with the original in the library of Corpus Christi College, at Cambridge.

January 8, 1674.

MATTHEW WHINN, Notary Public, and
Principal Register, Acad. Cant.”

This copy was obtained by Archbishop Bramhall for insertion in his Works, which were printed in 1677. It will be observed that its correctness is certified by the Notary Public and Register of Cant., Matthew Whinn.

The Nag’s-head Story being entirely overthrown by this testimony, the Romanists set on foot another story, represent-

* By reference to the Ordinal of Edward VI. we observe that our translation does not fully agree with it in language. It was spoken in English, and translated by the clerk into Latin, which gave occasion for some modification; and to this is added the liability to change in our free translation into English.

ing this as a forgery of modern times. To meet this, Archbishop Bramhall, or some one for him, procured the following certificates.

“Cambridge, Jan. 11th, 1674.

We, whose names are hereunto subscribed, having seen the original, whereof this writing is a perfect copy, and considered the hand, and other circumstances thereof, are fully persuaded that it is a true and genuine record of the Rites and ceremonies of Archbishop Parker's consecration, and as ancient as the date it bears. In witness whereof, we have hereunto set our hands the day and year above written,

HEN. PAMAN, Ort. Pub.

HEN. MORE, D. D.

RA. WIDDRINGTON, S. T. D.

and D. MARS, P.”

After this, there seems to have been another story gotten up, that this record of Cambridge did not harmonize with that of Canterbury, kept in Lambeth Palace; and hence it was to be inferred that one, or both, must be false. To meet this slander, some one in 1720, (we know not who,) procured the following certificate from Lambeth. Courayer states in his “Defense of the Validity of the English Ordinations,” that he had deposited the original in the King's Library (at Paris,) on the ninth of May, 1722; whence we may infer that he procured it for his own use in preparing his “Defense,” which appeared about that time.

“We, whose names are subscribed, do certify, that we have collated and compared together, the Records of the R. R. Matthew Parker's consecration, printed in a book entitled, ‘The Works of the most Rev. Father in God, John Bramhall, D. D., late Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland,’ printed at Dublin in the year 1677, *in Fol.*, which Records, excepting some passages hereafter mentioned, we have found very conformable to the original, which is preserved in the archives of the archi-episcopal Palace at Lambeth, near London.

Dated at the Archi-Episcopal Palace at Lambeth, this 15th day of March, O. S., 1720.

Signed in the presence of

W. AYERST, S. T. B., and E. A. Pr.

JAMES PIERS, J. C.

PAT. PIERS, de Girardin, Dr. of the Sorbonne.

D. WILKINS, S. T. P., Rev. in Christo Patri Guil.

Archiep. Cant. à Sacris Dom.”

The discrepancies between the two Records, named in the above certificate, they give in full, naming the pages and lines. They are fourteen in all ; and the differences are merely verbal, and do not, in the least, affect their agreement in sense. We can hardly doubt that the same reporter furnished both copies for permanent record, (perhaps one was copied from the other,) and there is internal evidence of their having been written during the progress of the service, on the 17th of December, 1559.

Of the four consecrating Bishops, we may here remark, that their well-known position in the Church, long previous to Parker's Consecration, should place the fact of their Episcopal Consecration beyond controversy. Barlow had been Bishop of Bath and Wells in the time of Edward VI.; was displaced by Mary, and at the time of Parker's Consecration, was Bishop elect of Chichester. Scory had been Bishop of Chichester, and at the time of Parker's Consecration, was Bishop elect of Hereford. Miles Coverdale had grown old under many labors in the work of the Reformation. For a short time, he had been Bishop of Exeter, but, during the bloody reign of Mary, had resided abroad, and never became Bishop of another diocese. John Hodgkin, (named above as John de Bedford,) was Suffragan Bishop of Bedford. All these four had been named in the Queen's Commission, and all had been regularly consecrated Bishops. Moreover, all of them had been Bishops of Dioceses, except Hodgkin, who was a Suffragan, but was not, from this cause, any the less capable of acting in the consecration of Parker. We shall see, hereafter, that the Romanists afterward called in question the fact of Barlow's having ever been consecrated, himself; and as he was the consecrator of Parker, they proposed thereby to raise a question concerning the validity of Parker's Consecration. This will be treated in another chapter.

In addition to the records already produced, we find, that on the 22d day of March, 1560, Archbishop Parker received the investiture of Canterbury in his temporalities, which is strong presumptive evidence of his having been recently consecrated.

As for the Nags-head fable, it is manifest, as we have before said, that it was not known, nor thought of, until more than

fifty years after the Consecration of Parker. Not a syllable of it appears in any of the Romish writings within that time. Even Sanders, who violently attacked the English Consecrations, and attempted to invalidate them, says not a word of this story.

In answer to the positive testimony which we have produced, they argue, first, that it was fifty years after the Consecration of Parker, before the Lambeth and Cambridge records were proclaimed to the world, and hence, that they are to be suspected of forgery. Second, that the persons who published them were interested, and therefore are to be suspected. Third, that the records do not agree, and therefore are to be set aside.

In answer to the first objection, Courayer has well said :

“If the fable of the ordination of the Nag's-head had been more ancient than it is, we should have had the record sooner published, to destroy it; but where the method of this proceeding was known, what necessity was there to publish an account of it? How many records are there shut up, which are no less authentic for that reason? And besides, was it ever refused to be produced, or shown, to them who wanted information in this matter? It is a strange thing, if all the records that are kept private should be suspected because they were never exposed. What becomes of all our history if, to remove all suspicions, it should be objected that the records had hitherto been kept secret?”

But the fact was really *published* within Parker's life, which shows that it had not been “done in a corner,” nor was intended to be kept secret. In the “*Lives of the Archbishops*,” published at London in 1572, before Parker's death, it is stated, that—

“In the year 1559, he was chosen Archbishop of Canterbury, by the Dean and Chapter of the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury, and was afterwards, in the same year, on the 17th day of December, consecrated according to law by four Bishops, William, Bishop of Chichester, John, of Hereford, Miles, late Bishop of Exeter, and Richard, (John,) of Bedford. In the margin of that work it is written, when translated, ‘These consecrations and confirmations appear in the registers.’”

After Parker's death, when the Jesuits began to circulate the Nag's-head story, Archbishop Abbot, willing to do everything reasonable, to prove the genuineness of the Record, consented that four Romanists, three of whom were Jesuits, should come to Lambeth, and in his presence, and the presence of the Bishops of London, Durham, Ely, Bath, Lincoln, and Rochester, examine the Records, to their satisfaction. The pro-

posal was accepted; and at the end of the examination, they promised to report the result. After leaving, however, they requested that the Records should be *sent to them*, to examine more fully, by themselves. Of course, this was not permitted; and thereupon, they raised a report, that investigation had been refused. To have permitted the Official Records to go out into the world, and into the hands of sworn enemies, who might either interpolate, or destroy them, would have been most unwise, and contrary to all precedent. They were told that they might return to the palace, and examine them to their satisfaction; but this they refused to do, and persisted in complaining that they had not been permitted to examine them!

In short, all doubts raised by Romanists, of the genuineness of the Records, are based on assumptions of that character, which, if admitted, would forever destroy the science of History, and throw the world into entire doubt and uncertainty as to the truth of every fact, the moment it had become a thing of the past, and ceased to be visible; unless the principle were admitted, that the assertion of some Jesuit could set everything right, and remove all doubts.

As for their second objection, that the authors of the Records, and of their publication, were interested, and therefore not to be believed, it might be sufficient to reply, so were the authors of the Nag's-head story. Moreover, if this be admitted, then it follows, that the Records of no Nation, State, or Church, are to be believed, if kept by themselves. To make them reliable, they must be kept by strangers, who have no interest in them whatever; or, forsooth, by enemies, whose business it is to place the worst construction on everything. No one, we presume, will question, that had the recording of the Elizabethan Consecrations been committed to Jesuits, they might have appeared different from what they do; but whether more reliable, the common sense of the world will judge.

The third objection, that there is a discrepancy among the Records, and therefore, that none of them are to be relied on, requires examination, and to this we shall next ask the attention of our readers.

WE come now to the *Charge of discrepancy among the Records considered.*

On this, we first give the very open and manly views of the Roman Catholic, Courayer, in his own language :—

“The variations which we find among the several authors who have cited the Registers, make up the third objection against them, which in my opinion is the most apparent and the most reasonable. And this disagreement is very obvious; for one says that Parker was consecrated by Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, and John, Suffragan of Dover, (Bedford). Sutcliff joins to the three first, two Suffragans. The author of the lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, has but one Suffragan with the three Bishops, who is Richard, (John,) Suffragan of Bedford. Mason agrees with this latter, as to the number, only he calls the Suffragan, John. In short the Record of the 6th of December, found in Rymer, names seven to whom the mandate for consecration is addressed; that is to say, the Bishop Landaff, Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, Richard, (John), Suffragan of Bedford, John, Suffragan of Thetford, and the Bishop of Osory in Ireland. So that we see five different accounts of the same fact, and what are we to believe amidst so much variety? and what greater proof of the forgery of a Record, than the contrariety which is found among those that cite it?

“This difficulty appears astonishing at first sight, but when the disagreement, which at first seems considerable, is examined to the bottom, by degrees the objection at the same time vanishes away, as you will soon perceive.

“The Queen’s Letters Patent for the consecration of Parker must not, in the first place, be received in a sense that bears variety. She addresses her letters to seven, but the same letters imply that four of that number is sufficient to execute that commission. ‘*Quatenus vos, aut ad minus quatuor vestrum, eundem Matthaeum Parkerum, in Archiepiscopum praedictae, consecrare velitis cum effectu.*’ Now this is what agrees with Mason, the author of the ‘Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,’ and with Butler, and with Bramhall, Burnet, Collier, and all other succeeding writers.

“If Sutcliff mentions two Suffragans, it is because he was deceived by the Queen’s Letters Patent, in which there are two actually named, and did not observe that the Act inserted in the Registers mentions but one; and as to Butler, who mentions another Suffragan, if it be not the fault of the transcriber or the printer, it must proceed from his not consulting the Registers, and that he did cite them no otherwise than upon hearsay, or a bad memory.

“But what is here worth observing is, that those who have published this Record, always agree together. Bramhall and Burnet published it entire. Mason and Collier have either quoted large fragments out of it, or else the substance of it; and we find no disagreement in what they have published. The variations, therefore, in question not proceeding from the *act* itself, they ought not to be produced as proof of its being a forgery.

Before this Record was made public, there is reason to believe that it was cited only upon unfaithful reports, or bad memories. Now would it not be surprising, if such cases were always exact? And should a man so rashly condemn

a Record of inconsistency, whose substance is so uniform? For we see all agree that the ordination was performed by Barlow, Scorey and Coverdale, and all, (except one who puts in two,) mention one Suffragan; and if they do not agree in the name, yet one may see the reason very clearly in the Queen's Letters, wherein he will find the name wrong. These differences do not prove that there were different Acts of this Consecration, but that the Act in the Register was not exactly transcribed by those who quoted it; and this is what we see daily instances of among those who cite manuscripts, whose citations are found defective by those who more attentively examine after them; because the former, either by reason of precipitation, forgetfulness, or inadvertency, did not always read or cite exactly.

"In short, the *Act* even now exists in the Registers without any change; it is more than an hundred years that it has been seen such as it subsists to this day. Those who have cited it wrong did it by hearsay. There is no difference but about the *fact*, which *fact* is only one name placed for another. Even the variety of these citations proves that there was neither collusion nor forgery, but that they did not think fit to conceal things in favor of their own party. All these circumstances together, show that the differences objected are insufficient to prove the Record in question a forgery, and that in spite of these disagreements, it supports its authority; nay more, there are authentic certificates, given by public officers, to attest that the Record is the same with that which is published."*

The whole of the discrepancy is in the matter of one christian name. The Queen's commission for Consecration is addressed to Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Landaff, William Barlow, John Scorey, Miles Coverdale, *Richard* Hodgkin, Suffragan of Bedford, &c. But the Records show *John* Hodgkin as one of the officiating Bishops. The name of *Richard* seems to have been in the commission by mistake of the Queen's Secretary; if, indeed, the error be not more recent. No Bishop answering to that name is known among the Bishops of that time. *John* Hodgkin is well known to have been at that time Suffragan of Bedford; and the fact of his answering to the summons, and participating in the consecration of Parker, as shown by all the Records, is abundant proof, either that the original document was properly filled, or that it was regarded as merely a clerical blunder, and well understood. If it is

* Courayer's Defense of Anglican Ordinations. Chap. II, pp. 50-52. Oxford: 1844.

apparent that he, (John Hodgkin,) did officiate on the occasion, the question, by what name he had been called in the summons, or whether called at all, would be wholly foreign to the question of validity, according to the showing of Romanists themselves. That John Hodgkin was a Bishop, no one has ever seriously questioned. According to the old Records he was consecrated on the 8th of December, 1537, by John Stokesley, Bishop of London, John Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester, and Robert Wharton or Parfew, Bishop of St. Asaph.

Upon the whole, we think it must be apparent that this whole story about the discrepancy between the Commission and the Record is a matter of the very smallest importance, and does not, in the least, affect the main question at issue. There were three Bishops, without Hodgkin, any one of whom could have given a valid Consecration, as we shall hereafter see.

We shall close our examination of this point by inserting the testimony of one of the ablest scholars and historians of the Romish Church, viz.: the Rev. J. Lingard, D.D. So great was the esteem in which he was held as an historian, that he is reported to have been advised by the Romanists of England to decline a Cardinal's hat, that he might devote himself to the work of writing an History of England that should meet the views of the Romish Church. This important work, with many others of great value, he lived to complete.

In Vol. VII. Note J, American Edition, he writes thus :

"It may perhaps be expected that I should notice a story, which was once the subject of acrimonious controversy between the divines of the two communions. It was said that Kitchin and Scorey, with Parker and the other Bishops elect, met in a tavern called the Nag's head in Cheapside; that Kitchin, on account of a prohibition from Bonner, refused to consecrate them, and that Scorey, therefore, ordering them to kneel down, placed the Bible on the head of each, and told him to rise up Bishop. The facts that are really known are the following. The Queen, from the beginning of her reign, had designed Parker for the Archbishopric. After a long resistance, he gave his consent, and a *congé d'elire* was issued to the dean and chapter, July 18th, 1559. He was chosen August 1. On Sept. 9th, the Queen sent her mandate to Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, Bourne of Bath and Wells, Pool, of Peterborough, Kitchin, of Landaff, Barlow, the deprived Bishop of Bath, under Mary, and Scorey, of Chichester, also deprived under Mary, to confirm and consecrate the Archbishop elect. (Rym xv. 541.) Kitchin had conformed; and it was hoped that the other three,

who had not been present in Parliament, might be induced to imitate his example. All three, however, refused to officiate; and in consequence, the oath of supremacy was tendered to them; (Rym. xv. 545,) and their refusal to take it was followed by deprivation. In these circumstances no consecration took place; but three months later, (Dec. 6,) the Queen sent a second mandate, directed to Kitchin, Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, the deprived Bishop of Exeter, under Mary, John, Suffragan of Bedford, John, Suffragan of Thetford, and Bale, Bishop of Ossory; ordering them, or any four of them, to confirm or consecrate the Archbishop elect; but with an additional clause, by which she, of her supreme royal authority, supplied whatever deficiency there might be, according to the statutes of the realm, or the laws of the Church, either in the acts done by them, or in the person, state, or faculty of any of them; such being the necessity of the case, and the urgency of the time. (Rym. xv. 549.) Kitchin again appears to have declined the office. But Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale and Hodgkin, Suffragan of Bedford, confirmed the election on the 9th; and consecrated Parker on the 17th. The ceremony was performed, though with a little variation, according to the Ordinal of Edward VI. Two of the Consecrators, Barlow and Hodgkins, had been ordained Bishops, according to the Roman Pontifical: the other two according to the Reformed Ordinal. (Wilk. Conc. iv. 198.) Of this Consecration on the 17th of December, there can be no doubt; perhaps in the interval between the refusal of the Catholic prelates, and the performance of the ceremony, some meeting may have taken place at the Nag's head, which gave rise to the story."

A correspondent of the "Birmingham Catholic Magazine," having called on Dr. Lingard, through the pages of that periodical, for his proofs, the learned writer addressed the following letter to the Editor, some time in 1834.

MR. EDITOR,—In your last number a correspondent, under the signature of T. H., has called on me to show why I have asserted (Hist. v. 155, Note H,) that the Archbishop Parker was consecrated on the 17th of December, 1559. Though I despair of satisfying the incredulity of one who can doubt after he has examined the documents to which I have referred, yet I owe it to myself to prove to your readers the truth of my statement, and the utter futility of any objection which can be brought against it.

I. The matter in dispute is, whether Parker received, or did not receive consecration on the 17th of December; but the following facts are, and must be admitted on both sides: 1st. That the Queen having given the royal assent to the election of Parker, by the Dean and chapter of Canterbury, sent on September 9, a mandate to six prelates to confirm and consecrate the Archbishop-elect, and that they demurred, excusing, as would appear from what followed, their disobedience by formal exceptions on points of law. 2d. That on the 6th December, she issued a second commission to seven Bishops, ordering them, or any four of them to perform that office, with the addition of a sanatory clause, in which she supplied, by her supreme authority, all legal or ecclesiastical defects on account of the urgency of the time, and the necessity of the things; "*temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante,*" words which prove how much the Queen had this consecration at heart; and certainly not without reason, for at that time, with the exception of Landaff, there was not a diocese provided

with a Bishop, nor, as the law then stood, could any such provision be made without a consecrated Archbishop, to confirm and consecrate the Bishops-elect. 3d. That four out of seven Bishops, named in the commission, (they had been deprived or disgraced under Queen Mary, but had now come forward to offer their services, and solicit preferment in the new Church,) having obtained a favorable opinion from six counsel learned in the law, undertook to execute the commission, and confirmed Parker's election on the 9th of December.

II. Now, these facts being indisputable, what, I ask, should prevent the Consecration from taking place? The Queen required it, Parker, as appears from his subsequent conduct, had no objection to the ceremony, and the commissioners were ready to perform it, or rather under an obligation to do so; for by the 25th of Henry VIII. revived in the last parliament, they were compelled, under the penalty of *præmunire*, to proceed to the Consecration within twenty days after the date of the commission. Most certainly all these preliminary facts lead to the presumption that the Consecration did actually take place about the time assigned to it, the 17th of December, a day falling within the limits I have just mentioned.

III. In the next place, I must solicit the attention of your readers to certain indisputable facts, subsequent to that period. These are—1st. That on the 18th (and the date is remarkable) the Queen sent to Parker no fewer than six writs addressed to him, under the new style of Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, and primate and metropolitan of all England, and directing him to proceed to the Confirmation and Consecration of six Bishops elect for six different Sees. This was the first time, during the six months which had elapsed since his election, that any such writ had been directed to him. What, then, could have happened, just before the 18th, to entitle him to this new style, and to enable him to confirm and consecrate Bishops, which he could not do before? The obvious answer is, that he himself had been consecrated on the 17th. 2nd. That on the 21st, he consecrated four new Bishops, on the 21st of January five others, two more on the 2d, and two on the 24th of March. Can we suppose that so much importance would be attached to Consecration given by him if he had received no Consecration himself? or, that the new Church would have been left so long without Bishops at all, if it had not been thought necessary that he, who was by law to consecrate the others, should previously receive that rite? 3d. That afterward, at the same time with the new prelates, he obtained the restoration of his temporalities, a restoration which was never made till after Consecration. 4th. That he not only presided at the convocation, but sat in successive parliaments, which privilege was never allowed to any but consecrated Bishops. In my judgment, the comparison of these facts with those that preceded the 17th of December, forms so strong a case, that I should not hesitate to pronounce in favor of the Consecration, if even all direct and positive evidence respecting it had perished.

IV. But there exists such evidence in abundance. That Parker was consecrated on the 17th of December is asserted, 1st by Camden, (i. 49,) 2nd, by Godwin, (*De Præs.* p. 219,) 3d, by the Archbishop himself in his work, *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ*, published in 1572, three years before his death, or if that book be denied to be his, in his diary, in which occurs the following entry

in his own hand, "17th Dec. Ann. 1559 consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem. Heu! Heu! Domine Deus, in quæ tempora servasti me! (Strype's Parker, App. 15). And 4th, by the Archiepiscopal Register, a record which details the whole proceeding, with the names of the Bishops, of their chaplains, and of the official witnesses. In truth it descends to so many minute particulars, that I think, Mr. Editor, it must be the model after which are composed the descriptions of Consecrations, ordinations and dedications, which we have the pleasure of perusing in your pages. In one respect only must it yield the superiority to them. It names not either the organists or the singers.

V. Now to this mass of evidence, direct and indirect, what does your correspondent oppose? That Harding and Stapleton, and the more ancient Catholic controvertists, denied that Parker was a Bishop. That is indeed true: but I always understood that their objections (which is certainly the case with respect to the two passages quoted in your last number,) referred to validity, not to the fact of his Consecration; and if Dr. Milner has chanced to assert the contrary, I fear that he wrote it hastily, and without consideration. I am not aware of any open denial of the facts till about fifty years afterward, when the tale of the foolery supposed to have been played at the Nag's Head was published. In refutation of that story, Protestant writers appealed to the Register; their opponents disputed its authority, and the consequence was, that in 1614, Archbishop Abbot invited Colleton the Arch-priest, with two or three other Catholic missionaries, to Lambeth, and submitted the Register to their inspection in the presence of six of his own Episcopal colleagues. The details may be seen in Dodd, ii. 277, or in Godwin, p. 219.

VI. Your correspondent assures us that the Register contains "so many inaccuracies and points at variance with the history of the times, as manifestly prove it a forgery." Were it so, there still remains sufficient evidence of the fact. But what induces T. H. to make this assertion? Has he examined into all the circumstances of the case? or does he only take for granted the validity of the several objections which are founded on misconception or ignorance; that the Register agrees in every particular with what we know of the history of the times; and there exists not the semblance of a reason for pronouncing it a forgery.

VII. Your readers will observe, that in this communication I have confined myself to the fact of Parker's Consecration; whether it was valid or invalid, according to Catholic doctrine, is a theological question, with which, as a mere writer of history, I had no concern."

JOHN LINGARD.

The next point of our examination is, *Was William Barlow ever consecrated to the Office of Bishop?*

Driven from every point of attack on the direct question of Parker's Consecration, Romanists have fallen back and rallied on the question whether *William Barlow*, the presiding Bishop

at the Consecration of Parker, was ever himself consecrated! The proof of this is really unnecessary to the establishment of the *validity* of the Consecration, provided there be evidence of the other three, or any *one* of them, being a Bishop. For it has never been questioned that *one* Bishop was capable of consecrating another, or others; nor that such Consecration possessed all the essential elements of validity; though from very early times they have been uncanonical, and the Consecrators liable to censure. The commission has ever been regarded as coming from the Consecrating Bishop; the one who delivers to the candidate the Holy Scriptures, imposes hands, and uses the prescribed Form of words. All the Bishops present, or at least three, are required, by canon, to unite in the imposition of hands; but ordinarily, the presiding Bishop alone delivers the Scriptures, and pronounces the consecrating words; hence he is appropriately called the "Consecrating Bishop." In this case, it is granted that the validity of the Consecration must depend on the Consecrating Bishop. In the Consecration of Parker, however, we find a departure from the general usage, which happily settles all question as to the validity of his Orders, even though the previous Consecration of any one, or even *three*, of the officiating Bishops should be questioned. This has been happily noted in the works of Archbishop Bramhall:—

"It appears by the Register that Barlow presided at Parker's Consecration, i. e., Parker was presented to him by the other Bishops, and the usual interrogations were addressed to Parker by him, while all the four Bishops together joined in the imposition of hands, in the use of the form of words, and in the delivery of the Bible; i. e., in the Consecration itself. The position occupied by Barlow, therefore, does not answer to that of the Consecrating Bishop, (as it is termed,) who was usually either the metropolitan himself, or one commissioned by him; for the latter, (according to the canon of the fourth council of Carthage, and according to our Ordinal, both King Edward's and the present form,) pronounces the words of Consecration alone, the assistant Bishops joining in the imposition of hands, (in the words, however, also, according to the Roman Ordinal, although in a lower tone,) whereas, here in consecrating the metropolitan himself, all joined throughout, and equally. It follows, then, upon every theory, that the absence of Barlow's Consecration, if it were so, would not invalidate that of Parker."*

* Bramhall's Works, new edition, Vol. III, p. 136, Note 7.

The reason of all the Bishops performing the same part in the Consecration of Parker was, that neither one of them was a metropolitan, nor named by a metropolitan as Consecrator. In view of their official parity, it was deemed proper that all should perform the same part, in what constituted the essence of Consecration. This was unusual, but has never been urged as an objection to the Consecration, even by Romanists, and as the present question has been raised, it is fortunate.

With these preliminaries we come to the question of Barlow's Consecration. It has been denied by Romanists. The reasons assigned are, 1st. "Cranmer's Register, which contains the Consecrations performed by that prelate, or by his order, makes no mention of the Consecration of Barlow." 2nd. "In Rymer's collection there appears a Commission of the Queen, addressed to Parker, to confirm and consecrate Barlow, Bishop of Chichester." The question very naturally arises, if Barlow had been consecrated Bishop previous to Parker's Consecration, why should Parker afterward be commissioned to consecrate him? 3rd. "Bonner, Romish Bishop of London, threatened Anthony Kitchin, Bishop of Landaff, with excommunication, in case he should assist in the Consecration of Parker; but sent no such threat to Barlow, which he would certainly have done had he regarded him as a Bishop."

1st. It is generally admitted that Cranmer's Register does not take notice of Barlow's Consecration. This, however, is but negative testimony, and, in the absence of anything positive on either side, can do nothing more than raise a doubt. But although Cranmer's Register be silent on it, we have much positive testimony. Among the writings of Wharton, author of *Anglia Sacra*, we find the following: "William Barlow, at that time Prior of the Canons Regular of Bisham, of the Order of St. Augustine, was elected Bishop by the Dean and Chapter of St. Asaph, in the year 1536, January the 16th. On the 23rd of February he was confirmed by Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury."

The author of the *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, says, "William Barlow, S. T. P., was elected January 16, 1535, confirmed February 23 following, &c." The difference of O. S. and N. S.

is observable in the two writers; with this observation it is apparent that they perfectly harmonize. Barlow was elected January 16, 1535-6, and confirmed on the 23rd of February following. Many writers testify to the same effect. Of this there is no question, and all that is wanting is a positive record of his Consecration. Now let it be borne in mind that his confirmation could not have taken place but for the writ of the Crown; and that this writ, or mandate, invariably required not only the confirmation, but the Consecration, to take place within twenty days from the date thereof, on pain of *præmunire*; which was nothing short of complete ruin to the metropolitan, by Act 25 of Henry VIII. Rymer assures us that the writ for confirmation and Consecration was addressed by the King, Henry VIII., to the metropolitan, Cranmer, on the 22nd of February, and that the confirmation took place on the day following; and as no censure was ever passed on Cranmer for neglect of duty, and Barlow is found, soon after, in the performance of his Episcopal function, there is the strongest presumptive evidence of his Consecration.

We know it is sometimes urged by Romanists, that the Protestants became very loose in their notions of the importance of Consecration, and of all ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies. This may have been the case with some of them, at a later period, but let it be observed this was in 1536, while Henry VIII. was yet on the throne; who never, to the day of his death, entertained any other than Romish notions, save in the matter of the papal jurisdiction. The only change which he ever made, was to strike out of the Ordinal the Oath of allegiance to the Pope. During his life, the idea of dispensing with Consecration in a Bishop could not have been tolerated.

As for the omission in Cranmer's Register, it proves nothing, even were there no positive or presumptive evidence against it. It is well known that the Records of those times were not kept with very great care. Francis Mason, in his *Defense of the Ministry of the Church*, declares that there are a great many other Consecrations about that time, which have been omitted, and yet have never been questioned. Among them he mentions those of Gardiner, Fox and King, neither one of which

appears in the Register ; but no Romanist has ever been found to question the fact of their Consecration. Another writer of note, after examining the Register with much care, says, "The Consecration of Barlow is not to be found in Cranmer's Register, no more are those of several other Bishops, whose ordinations have hitherto been never disputed by any body ; such as Fox, Bishop of Hereford, Sampson of Chichester, Bell of Worcester, Day of Chichester, whose Consecrations are entirely omitted. What shall I say of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, Latimer of Worcester, White of Lincoln, Bayne of Litchfield, Tuberville of Exeter, Hopton of Norwich, Goldwell of St. Asaph ; whose confirmations and Consecrations, if I am not very much mistaken, are not to be found now in the Archiepiscopal Registers."

Another proof of Barlow's Consecration, by no means unimportant, is in the fact that from about the time of his well attested confirmation, or soon after, he regularly occupied his seat in the House of Lords. But it is well known, that membership in the House of Lords had never been granted since 1327, on the accession of Edward III., to any Bishop elect, but only on presentation of the King's Writ, in virtue of which he was put in possession of his temporalities ; and this instrument could be obtained, only on his presenting to the King a certificate of Consecration. This was matter of law, or at least of fixed custom, from which the Parliament never departed. But in all the Convocations and sessions of Parliament under Henry VIII., from 1536, Barlow was always summoned with the other peers of the realm, and took his seat with them ; not as a "Guardian of the Spiritualities," nor as Bishop elect, nor Bishop confirmed, but as *Bishop* ; and "even to place of other Bishops, whose consecrations were never questioned." So it appears on the Records of the House of Lords. Moreover, it is well known that in the time of Henry VIII. Barlow was called upon to assist in the Consecration of other Bishops. According to Cranmer's Register, he assisted by order of the Crown, in the Consecration of Arthur Buckley, Bishop of Bangor, on the 19th of February, 1542.

Another proof of his being regarded as a true Bishop,—Bishop of Bath,—comes from a source which should certainly be credible among Romanists. When Queen Mary came to the Crown in 1553–4, it is known that many of the Protestant Bishops, from fear of persecution, deserted their posts, and went to the Continent for protection; among these was Barlow. These were all construed into resignations, and most of the places filled by Romish Bishops. The commission drawn up by the Chapter of Canterbury for the government of the Church of Bath, during the vacancy of the See, declares it to be vacant “by the free and voluntary resignation of William Barlow, *the last Bishop and Pastor of that Church.*” This same clause is in the *Congé d’élire* directed to the Chapter of Bath by Queen Mary, bearing date March 13, 1554. So in the act of investiture assigned to his successor, the same words appear. Thus, the Romish Church, under Queen Mary, acknowledges him as a true Bishop, and proceeds to fill his place, only *because of his “free and voluntary resignation.”* Moreover, a sentence was afterward passed upon him, depriving him of his Bishoprick.

Upon the whole, though the Register of Canterbury be at fault in the matter of Barlow’s Consecration, the evidence is as clear of his being a regularly consecrated Bishop, as the most faithful historian could desire. It is not doubted that he was elected and confirmed Bishop of St. Asaph, in 1536, and immediately translated to St. David’s. That he was translated thence to the See of Bath and Wells in 1548, and that he was exiled in 1553–4, on the accession of Mary; and that on the accession of Elizabeth, in 1558, he was called to the See of Chichester, where he spent the remainder of his life. It is, moreover, true that a question of his Consecration was never raised until about the time of James I. in 1603, some seventy-five years after his Consecration, and long after his death. Hence we have no fear in committing the question to the intelligence of the Church and the world; not doubting the verdict that will be rendered in due time.

2nd. The second objection, that the King’s mandate was issued for Parker to consecrate Barlow, soon after Barlow had

assisted to consecrate him, (Parker,) needs but little attention. This is founded on Rymer's assertion, that it so appears in the Rolls. If it were so, it would prove but little, seeing that it was no uncommon thing in those times, for the mandate to order the *Consecration* of a Bishop, when only his confirmation or institution as Bishop of a certain Diocese was meant, he having been translated from one Diocese to another, and previously consecrated. Courayer enumerates not less than seven cases where the mandates, as they stand on the Rolls, order a *Consecration*, where the evidence was clear of previous Consecration; and where nothing was meant but a *confirmation* of a translation. On the other hand, he quotes five cases where the mandate ordered only the *confirmation* where Consecration was intended, and the Register shows that it actually took place.

But after this had been long discussed, it was agreed to have a new examination of the Records in the Chapel at the Rolls, when the astounding truth was revealed that Rymer had misread the Record, and that the mandate only orders the confirmation and Institution of Barlow in his new Bishoprick of Chichester. "I positively affirm," says the Clerk, "that there is no error in the royal mandate. The fault, be it what it will, was altogether Rymer's; who, finding seven mandates together of the same tenor, did not accurately enough observe in what manner five of them were expressed; namely, that the nominated in them were both to be confirmed and consecrated; and that the other two, (viz.: those that belonged to Barlow and Scorey,) required only that they should be confirmed." Thus, all the splendid logic predicated on this story falls to the ground; the fact on which it rests being proved entirely false.

3d. The third, and last objection,—that if Bonner had recognized Barlow as a Bishop, he would have threatened him, as he did Kitchin, in the case of the Nag's-head Consecration,—demands but little attention. In the first place, it is begging one of the main questions under consideration. It assumes the truth of the whole Nag's-head story—or at least the major part of it—which we have shown to be fabulous and false, throughout. But assuming it to be true, as we have previ-

ously intimated in the case of the Bishop of Landaff, so we still more strongly assert in the case of Barlow, it is little probable that a threat from Bonner, whom Barlow regarded as ex-communicate, or even from the Pope himself, whose jurisdiction Barlow had long since ignored, should have cut any figure, or arrested the least attention. Whatever may have been the timidity of the old Bishop of Landaff, Barlow's course had long been determined; so that Bonner could not have entertained the idea of intimidating him by any threat of Papal vengeance. But until the Nag's-head fiction can be proved to possess a single word of truth, from first to last, it is utterly useless to argue any question arising out of it.

The question of Barlow's Consecration, though not essential, as we have shown, to that of Parker, we have now examined; and if, from the very nature of the question, the proof falls short of absolute demonstration, yet, we flatter ourselves that the array of facts is such as, to all thinking minds, to render it morally certain that Barlow, one of the Consecrators of Parker, had been regularly consecrated to the Office of Bishop. On this point we quote again the language of the Romish historian, Lingard. He says :

"When, therefore, we find Barlow, during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated as a brother with the other Consecrated Bishops, discharging with them all the duties, both spiritual and secular, of a Consecrated Bishop, summoned equally with them to Parliament and Convocation, taking his seat among them according to his Seniority, and voting on all subjects as one of them, it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both Church and State, he could not have become a member of the Episcopal body."—*Lingard's History*, &c. Boston, 1854. vol. vii., p. 338.

Let it be remembered that this is Lingard's language, in his latest revised edition, which he completed just before his death, in 1851. So far from retracting his previously expressed opinion as to what he himself stigmatized the "Nag's-head fable," he fortified that opinion by unanswerable facts and arguments, which are enough to shame our modern assailants into silence.

We come next to the question, *Was there any essential defect in the matter or form of Parker's Consecration?* This is the only other objection, of any importance, urged by Roman-

ists to the Anglican Consecrations. It is alleged, that the Ordinal of Edward VI. used in the Consecration of Parker, and ever after, until the time of Charles II., and with slight modifications still retained in the English, Scotch, and American Churches, is defective in matter and form, and therefore incapable of conveying Holy Orders, however genuine may have been the Consecration of the Bishops using it. By *matter*, we are to understand that which is *done*; by *form*, that which is *said*, in the Service of Consecration, or Ordination.

It is readily granted that the Ordinal, together with the entire Liturgy, was revised in the time of Edward VI., both in respect of matter and form. This was done in accordance with a universal consent of all ages, fully expressed by the Romish Council of Trent, "that the Church always had a power of making such Constitutions and alterations, in the dispensation of the Sacraments, provided their substance was preserved, as it should judge, with regard to the variety of circumstances, times, and places, to be most expedient for the salvation of the receivers, or the veneration of the Sacraments, *themselves*." We quote the language of the Council of Trent; and would call particular attention to the fact, that that body included Ordination, in all its grades, in the word *Sacrament*; that being held by the Romish Church as one of the Seven Sacraments.

In this, the Council spoke a well-known sentiment of the Church Catholic; and the English Church, in revising the Ordinal, acted on the same well-recognized principle. It is readily granted that where matter, or form, is prescribed in Holy Writ, the Church has no power to alter them. For instance; Christ has appointed Water, in Baptism; and no Ecclesiastical authority can substitute another element. So Christ hath ordained Bread and Wine in the Holy Communion; and the Church cannot dispense with nor provide a substitute for either. So He has appointed a *form* in Baptism—the name of the Blessed Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—and this, the whole Catholic Church, in solemn Council assembled, dares not and cannot change. But in the conferring of Holy Orders, the Word of God has prescribed no

form, nor given any direction, farther than we learn of the Apostolic "Laying on of hands." Hence, all matter, and form, beyond this, is purely conventional, or canonical. The learned Morinus, a Catholic canonist of great repute, declares that "The imposition of hands is the only essential *matter* of this Sacrament." Other matter has, indeed, been used, at different times; such as the *Uction*, the *Imposition of the Book of the Gospels*, and the *delivery of the keys*, and other instruments. These, we believe, are still used in the Romish Church; but that they are essential to the validity of Orders, cannot be shown, any more than that salt and honey are essential to the validity of Baptism. The Uction, it is well-known, is not, nor ever was, in use in the Greek Church. The Delivery of the Instruments, according to Morinus, Mabillon, and Martene, was scarcely known before the ninth century; and the Imposition of the Books, though more ancient, was certainly omitted by the Syrians and Maronites, and generally unknown in the earliest ages of the Church; Alcuin, a writer of great prominence in the eighth century, declares, "There is no authority to be produced for it, either ancient or new; nay, not so much as the tradition of the particular Church of Rome." "It gives us no scandal," says Fulbertus Carnot, Ep. 2, "to hear that there have always been different usages and customs, but the same common faith in the Churches of Christ." Nay, even L'Abbe Renaudot, a prominent champion of Romanism against the Anglican Consecrations, admits that there was no essential defect in Parker's Consecration with regard to the *matter*; and insists only on the defects of the *form*, which he declares was "unknown to all the Pontificals of the Christian world."

As to what constitutes the essential *form* of words, in Ordination, or Consecration, there has, we believe, never been anything like a general agreement. In most Churches, the laying on of hands has been preceded, and followed, by prayers. Also, in most of the Western Churches, it has been accompanied with, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost, &c." "Take the Holy Ghost, &c." "But," says Morinus, "there are no Latin Rituals of any antiquity to be met with, that have these words in them; nor is there any mention made of them even in many of much later times. It is scarce four hundred years since

they began to be used among the Latins; but as for the Greeks and Syrians, they neither do at present, nor ever did, make use of them; so that there is no reason for making them of the substance of Ordination." Martene says, "These words, Receive thou the Holy Ghost, &c., are scarce to be met with in any pontifical that is four hundred years old."

With regard to the prayers used before, and after, the laying on of hands, it is to be observed that those in the Syriac Ordinals, are quite different from those of the Greek; and these, different from those of the Roman Churches; and even among these, though we observe a greater degree of uniformity, there is much diversity. Fulbertus remarks, "In many particulars, Greece and Spain differ; the Churches, also, of Rome and France differ from them; yet we receive no scandal from thence." In short, there is no reason to question that, as in the whole Liturgy, so in the Ordinal, there has been a general consent, from early times, that every Bishop should have liberty in matters of form; the essence, of course, being preserved. It is not a little remarkable that the Romish Church has ever approved the orders of the Greek Church, and continues to do so to this day, notwithstanding the difference in their Ordinals.

One single objection of Archbishop Kenrick's, which he presses with great earnestness, we may notice in few words. He insists that there is nothing in the consecrating sentence to show whether the candidate is being admitted to the grade of Bishop, Priest, or Deacon.

It is readily granted that if a stranger were to enter the Church just at the moment when this sentence was uttered, having no acquaintance with Church usages, and should depart immediately on hearing that one sentence, he might be at a loss to determine its import. The same must be admitted of many parts of the Service of the Romish Church, and of every other Church. But to say that there is, in the Office for Consecrating Bishops, nothing to show whether they are created Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, is so utterly absurd, that we wonder any writer, however insignificant, should ever have ventured on the assertion. To say nothing of the presentation of the candidates, the questions asked, and the prayers used,

before and after Ordination, all of which clearly specify the Office, the ordaining sentences are different and distinctive. In short, it is impossible for even the most superficial observer to attend on any one of the Services, without receiving the clearest and most distinct idea of the Office conferred. But, not to waste time on this puerile objection, we simply refer to the fact already shown, that no form has been prescribed in Holy Writ, and that the Church Catholic has never fixed on any one; the customs being different in different countries, and no objection ever raised concerning the form, until since the English Reformation.

Thus, we have shown, in as few words as possible, that the only essential *matter* known to the Church Catholic, is "the laying on of hands;" and the only *form* generally approved, or deemed necessary, is in the words, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost, &c., or, "Take the Holy Ghost, &c. That both this matter and form were used in Parker's Consecration cannot be questioned, if the Registers and authentic Records are to be believed. Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, writing on the authority of the Records, says; "after offering up several prayers and supplications to God, according to the form prescribed in the book of Common Prayer, established by Act of Parliament, the Bishops of Chichester and Hereford, the Suffragan of Bedford, and Miles Coverdale, laid their hands upon the Archbishop, and said, in English, "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee, by the imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness." This is in perfect agreement with the Ordinal of Edward VI.

It is readily granted that there was no unction, nor the delivery of any instruments, nor the laying of the sacred books on the head, neck, or shoulders, of the candidate. The Sacred Scriptures were *presented* to him, according to the Ordinal, with the charge, "Give heed unto reading, &c." But this, according to the sense of the Church, of all ages, was not of the essence of Consecration. It is regarded as purely figurative; being admissible, in good taste, and well calculated to impress the candidate, and all present, with the truly ministerial character of the Office conferred; but not as being in any way

essential. Morinus, on the subject of the *imposition* of the Book of the Gospel, says, after speaking of the diversity of usage in this respect, "This variety shows us, as in a glass, what little stress is to be laid upon those arguments which many are influenced by, in asserting, or denying, the imposition of the Book of the Gospels to belong to the matter of Episcopal Ordination. For being, myself, determined by other reasons—by reasons derived from ecclesiastical tradition—I conclude that the imposition of the Gospels upon the neck and shoulders of the person Ordained, no ways affects the substance of Episcopal Ordination."

In short, the whole of this ado of Romanists about the insufficiency of the matter and form of Anglican Ordinations, is predicated on the assumption of what is neither self-evident, admitted, nor proved—that nothing can be approved of God which has not the endorsement of the Romish Church.

